



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

SC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/647,805	08/25/2003	Ira Liao	3304.2.81	2355
21552	7590	07/18/2005	EXAMINER	
MADSON & METCALF GATEWAY TOWER WEST SUITE 900 15 WEST SOUTH TEMPLE SALT LAKE CITY, UT 84101			TUNG, KEE M	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2671	
			DATE MAILED: 07/18/2005	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/647,805	LIAO ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kee M. Tung	2671

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 June 2005.

2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.

3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-21 is/are pending in the application.
4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
6) Claim(s) 1-8 and 10-21 is/are rejected.
7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).

11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
a) All b) Some * c) None of:
1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date .

4) Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. .
5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) Other:

DETAILED ACTION

The amendment filed 6/20/05 has been considered in preparing this Office action.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-17 and 19-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA"), Fig. 1 of the drawings and the respective areas of the specification in view of Diaz et al (5,812,789 hereinafter "Diaz") or Belt (5,974,471).

APA teaches a graphics display module (such as, graphics card 14 includes the A/D converter 143, a graphics chip 141 and a local memory 142 for storing input data) for use with an image pickup device (such as, TV turner 15 and A/D converter 143 to convert analog signal into digit signal), a system memory (13) includes an AGP memory (131) for storing graphics data in DMA mode (paragraph 0003) and an image display device (not shown, but is inherent to include a display device in order to display graphics information to a user and is well known in the art to couple to the graphics card 14) in a computer system (Fig. 1), the computer system further comprising a CPU (10) connects to a north bridge chip (11) and a south bridge chip (12). However, APA fails to explicitly teach or suggest, "the graphics display module (or graphics card) further

includes a data compressing device for compressing the digital image data and data decompressing device for decompressing the compressed image data." These are what Diaz or Belt teaches. Diaz teaches different ways to integrated a compressing and decompressing devices (decoder/encoder 45) into an integrated graphics chip (Fig. 2, 40 and Fig. 4, integrated graphics accelerator 200) and/or a north bridge chip (Fig. 3, integrated core logic chipset 150). Belt also teaches a similar integrated circuit (Figs. 1 and 7) which a compressing and decompressing device (codec 172) can be integrated into a graphics logic (126) and a chipset (106). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of Diaz or Belt into the system of APA in order to compressed the image data before being stored or transmitted and therefore to reduce the bus bandwidth for data transmission and reduce the memory capacity for storing compressed data and increase efficiency of the overall system as taught by Diaz (col. 4, lines 30-57) or Belt (abstract and col. 2, lines 5, to 6 and 40-48). Therefore, at least claims 1-5, 8-11, 14-17 and 19-21 would have been obvious.

3. Claims 6, 7, 12, 13 and 18 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over applicant's Admitted Prior Art (hereinafter "APA"), Fig. 1 of the drawings and the respective areas of the specification in view of Diaz et al (5,812,789 hereinafter "Diaz") or Belt (5,974,471) as applied to claims 5, 8 and 16 above, and further in view of Langendorf (6,630,936).

The teachings of combined system of APA and Diaz or APA and Belt are given in previous paragraph of this Office action. However, the combined system fails to

explicitly teach or suggest the integrated graphics chip can be further integrated into north bridge core logic chipset. This is what Langendorf teaches (Fig. 4, chipset 200). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the present invention was made to combine the teachings of integrated circuit of Langendorf into the combined system of APA and Diaz or APA and Belt in order to further reduce the chip size, reduce power dissipation, to reduce the overall system cost and increase bus bandwidth and overall system performance. Therefore, at least claims 6, 7, 12, 13 and 18 would have been obvious.

Response to Arguments

4. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-8 and 10-21 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kee M. Tung whose telephone number is 571-272-7794. The examiner can normally be reached on Tuesday - Friday from 5:30 am - 4:00 pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ulka Chauhan can be reached on 571-272-7782. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).



Kee M Tung
Primary Examiner
Art Unit 2671